From:	PETERSON Jenn L
To:	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject:	FW: carp and PCBs
Date:	12/10/2007 12:24 PM
Attachments:	CarpRisk.xls

Hi Eric,

I talked with Dana about this, and she thought I should forward this on to you. We may have to figure out how to use the round 1 tissue data with the detection limit issues (e.g. 1254) for getting a total PCB number that makes sense. I don't think dropping out 1254 from the sum and COI lists is appropriate given the elevated detection limits (this was done for the ERA). Using congener total may resolve the issue, but we don't have congener data for all fish types (e.g. eco fish).

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov [mailto:Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 07, 2007 3:15 PM
To: Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; PETERSON Jenn L
Subject: carp and PCBs

The attached file contains carp data from round 1 for the composite samples collected from the 2 locations in the PDX harbor. It includes lipid, PCBs 1248, 1254,1260, and DDE for fillets and whole body. For whole body values, the 1260 concentrations show extreme variation (huge range) which is odd for a wide ranging species. The variability appears independent of lipid values. The 1254 values also show a huge range, and all values are undetected, which brings into questions the reliability of the analytical method used. Aroclor 1248 and DDE are much less variable. My questions are this:

1) to make risk estimates, we will need to rely on a total PCB value for fish from round 1 that is Aroclor based because we do not have congener data. Based on the variability of the data, I have doubts that the results for 1260, the most detected aroclor, are reliable. Has EPA reviewed and OK'd the QC data for Aroclor 1260 and will we be using it to base EPCs, etc. on?

2) what values and in which matrices are the human health people basing their decision on for PCBs in round 1 fish?

3) The results for some other fish are highly variable as well. Has EPA ok'd the PCB results from the other fish?

4) The "Sampletype" indicates that 4 of the 6 sample are field replicates, yet there are 3 unique sample numbers, and 6 results, so I do not understand what the field replicates represent. What do the field replicates represent, and why would you need 4 field replicates for 2 samples?

I think we will need to include the new carp sample results from round 3 into the risk assessment when they come in. thanks-jeremy